

REMARKS

The specification has been amended to correct an inadvertent typographical error in the paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4.

The title and claims 10, 12 and 13 are amended so as not to be limited to control of a decorative accessory lighting system. This is more consistent with the scope of claim 1 and find support, for example, in the Abstract and the paragraph bridging pages 7 and 8 of the specification.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Rudenberg, both of record, either alone or further in view of one of Picklo, of record, Park or Ming, both newly cited. In support of the rejections, the examiner contends that Brown discloses a control system with a receiving unit including power input leads 34, 35 adapted to be connected to battery voltage “at any of the remote locations on the vehicle.” This is incorrect.

A fundamental aspect of the invention is that the control system receiver can be located at any of a number of locations on a vehicle which are remote from the onboard vehicle battery, but at which battery voltage may be accessible. Thus, the receiver can be connected to vehicle battery voltage at the remote location, so that the receiver can be powered by the vehicle battery and does not require its own battery. In order to clarify this point, independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended to specify a control system for use with a vehicle “which vehicle has an onboard battery” and circuitry delivering the battery voltage to plural “access locations on the vehicle remote from the battery.” The claims further require that the receiving unit is adapted to be connected “to battery voltage” (i.e., the voltage of the vehicle battery, which is the only battery mentioned in the independent claims) at one of the “access locations” (i.e., a location other than the location at which the battery itself is located). No such arrangement is disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Contrary to the examiner's contention, Brown provides no teaching or suggestion of any location for the receiving units 19, 30 other than under the hood adjacent to the onboard vehicle battery 16, so that it can be directly connected to the battery. A fundamental feature of applicants' invention is the capability of locating the remote control receiver at any of a number of other locations on a vehicle remote from the vehicle battery, at which remote locations connection to a controlled device would be greatly simplified. In the Brown arrangement, on the other hand, if the device controlled by the receiver 19, 30 is located anywhere other than under the hood adjacent to the vehicle battery, separate wiring would have to be run from that device to the receiver. Rudenberg does not provide the missing teaching since, as the examiner acknowledges, in Rudenberg the receiver has its own battery, so that there is no provision for connecting the receiver to the vehicle battery voltage.

The secondary references also fail to teach this fundamental aspect of the invention as recited in amended claims 1 and 10.

New claim 17 is dependent on claim 10 and is, therefore, patentable for the same reasons as is claim 10.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is believed that, as amended, each of claims 1-17 is now in condition for allowance and the allowance thereof is respectfully asked.

Respectfully submitted,

Seyfarth Shaw LLP
Attorneys for Assignee
55 East Monroe Street,
Suite 4200
Chicago, Illinois 60603-5803
312-346-8000

By 